



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/189,365	11/09/1998	NIELS GEBAUER	33012/253/10	5433

7590 05/12/2003

CHARLES A JOHNSON
UNISYS CORPORATION
P O BOX 64942
MS 4772
ST PAUL, MN 55164

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, GRETA LEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2003

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/189,365

Applicant(s)

GEBAUER ET AL.

Examiner

Greta L. Robinson

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-14 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 March 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 04 March 2003 is: a) ☐ approved b) ☒ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2177

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application.
2. Claims 1, 3, 11, and 16 have been amended.
3. **Smith** was cited as prior art in the last office action paper number fifteen.

Drawings

4. The corrected or substitute drawings were received on March 4, 2003. These drawings are not approved because figure 6 still contains an extra lead line without a reference label. Also, two different reference numbers are referencing the same element; note reference numbers 148 and 100 are both pointing at the COOL ICE gateway, elements 158 and 102 are both pointing at the COOL ICE Handler, and reference numbers 152 and 154 are both pointing towards the storage. Descriptive textual labels are needed to distinguish the elements.

5. The drawings are objected to because figure 6 contains an extra lead without a reference label and leads for elements 152, 148, 140 and 160 are confusing with respect to the proper element that should be noted. See MPEP 37 CFR 1.84 (q) and 37 CFR 1.84(r). Correction is required. Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this office

Art Unit: 2177

action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

6. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters 152 and 154 have both been used to designate the same elements. Also note reference characters 148, 100, 164, 170, 158, and 102. Applicant is asked to review the drawings and correct any other occurrences where multiple reference characters appear to reference the same element. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Double Patenting

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 2177

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claim 6 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 6 of copending Application No. 09/189,160. Although the conflicting claim is not identical, it is not patentably distinct from each other because it is well settled that omission of elements and their functioning is obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. See In re Karlson 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA 1963).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

With respect to claim 6:

- a. a user terminal having a user-id;
- b. a database management system having access to a data base with a plurality of data tables responsively coupled to said user terminal; and

Art Unit: 2177

c. a security profile located within said data base management system corresponding to said user-id wherein said data base management system provides access to a particular first one of said plurality of data tables of said data base by said user terminal if and only if said user-id corresponds to said security profile and prohibiting access to a particular second one of said plurality of data tables of said data base by said data base by said user terminal if said uer-id does not correspond to said second one of said plurality of data tables independent of any particular data base management function required for said access [see claim 6, application no. 09/189,160]. It would have been obvious to substitute the data base management system of app. 09/189,160 for the plurality of data tables since both are essentially the same (i.e. the database management system encompasses the two database tables). The plurality of data tables (present application) are equivalent to the plurality of data bases (application 09/189, 160).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was

Art Unit: 2177

commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith US Patent 4,956,769.

With respect to claim 1, **Smith** teaches in a data processing environment having a database management system ... a user terminal with a user-id wherein said user terminal generates a service request which service request requires performance of one of said plurality of data base management functions wherein said performance of said one of said plurality of data base management functions requires access to said first data table [col. 1 line 57 through col. 2 line 2], the improvement comprising:

a security profile corresponding to said user-id whereby said data base management system ... if and only if said security profile corresponds to access to said first data table without regard to which of said plurality of data base management functions is required to perform said service request [see: col. 2 lines 2-17; col. 3 lines 58-61; col. 4 lines 8-66; figure 1 and 2].

Art Unit: 2177

Smith teaches the invention substantially as cited above, they teach a data processing environment in which different levels of security may be programmed into the system for access. Although Smith teaches the invention as cited above they do not explicitly teach that the security profile corresponds to access to said first data table without regard to which of said plurality of a database management functions that are performing the service request. **Smith** does teach access rules in which the I/O operations may be defined [note abstract; figure 1 col. 1 line 58 through col. 2 line 17; col. 4 lines 49-66]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have customized the access since Smith teaches profile access rules may be defined and that a given user can have a specific access rule [see col. 4 lines 15-24].

11. With respect to claims 2-4:

(Claim 2) wherein said security profile corresponds to said first data table and does not correspond to access of said second data tables [note I/O operations for access to first and second tables may be defined see col. 2 lines 3-17].

(Claim 3) further comprising a second user terminal with a second user-id for generating a second service request requiring access to said second data table wherein said second user terminal is prohibited from accessing said first data table ... [note rules for specific groups may be defined see col. 2 lines 18-25 and col. 3 line 62 through col. 4 line 68].

(Claim 4) further comprising a third user terminal with a third user-id for generating a third service request for accessing said first data table and said second data table wherein said

Art Unit: 2177

third user-id corresponds to a third security profile for accessing both of said first data table and said second data table [note col. 2 lines 18-25].

12. With respect to claim 6:

- a. a user terminal having a user-id [col. 1 line 58 through col. 2 line 2];
- b. a database management system having access to a data base with a plurality of data tables responsively coupled to said user terminal [col. 2 lines 3-10; abstract]; and
- c. a security profile located within said data base management system corresponding to said user-id wherein said data base management system provides access to a particular one of said plurality of data tables of said data base by said user terminal if and only if said user-id corresponds to said security profile ... independent of any particular data base management function required for said access [col. 2 lines 2-17; col. 3 lines 58-61; col. 4 lines 8-66; figure 1 and 2].

13. With respect to claims 7-10:

(Claim 7) wherein said user terminal causes said data base management system to communicate with said data table by transferring a service request to said data base management system ... (Claim 8) wherein said data base management system communicates with said data base using particular command language script ... (claim 9) wherein said service request corresponds to said particular command language script ... (claim 10) said security profile corresponds to said

Art Unit: 2177

particular command language script [figures 1 and 2; also some type of command language script is necessary for I/O interfacing].

14. With respect to claim 11:

transmitting a service request ... receiving said service request ... determining a security profile corresponding to said ... comparing said security profile with said user-id ... honoring said service request if and only if said user-id corresponds to said security profile ... [col. 2 lines 2-17; col. 3 lines 58-61; col. 4 lines 8-66; figure 1 and 2].

15. The limitations of claims 12-14 have been addressed above in claims 7-10 therefore they are rejected under the same rationale.

16. With respect to claim 16:

a. means having a user-id for permitting a user to use a service request to interact with a data table of a digital data base having a plurality of data tables;

b. means responsively coupled to said permitting means for offering data processing services to said user in response to said service request involving access to said data table in accordance with one of a plurality of data base management functions; and

c. means responsively coupled to said offering means for preventing said offering means from offering data processing services to said user in response to said service request

Art Unit: 2177

unless said user-id corresponds to a security profile wherein said security profile permits access to said data table ... one of said plurality of data base management functions [col. 2 lines 2-17; col. 3 lines 58-61; col. 4 lines 8-66; figure 1 and 2].

Allowable Subject Matter

17. Claims 5 and 15 are allowed. The prior art of record fails to teach the combined elements wherein the database management system is CLASSIC MAPPER.

Response to Arguments

18. In the remarks Applicant argued the following:

In Smith there is no way to permit a first request to a first qualified data element using a first function and prohibit access to a second qualified data element. Smith cannot provide a multi-user environment in which users are each given access to separate data tables and prohibited access to other tables.

In response: Smith teaches “limiting the access of selected users on selected data records and data fields of the databases” see column 1 lines 65-68. Smith teaches an access profile table column 5 lines 9-13; and a “data security profile entry defining the Input/Output operations permitted on the data record” note col. 2 lines 7-10, col. 4 lines 59-66, and col. 5 lines 50-59. Smith does grant access to certain data and groups to prevent access to data based upon the user-id and the particular function to be performed see abstract and col. 2 lines 3-17. Smith teaches

Art Unit: 2177

that the I/O operations permitted on the database may be defined. The user-id in Smith is important as to which data may be accessed, note Smith teaches defining I/O operations on a particular record or data field identified col. 2 lines 3-10.

19. Applicant's arguments filed November 18, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Regnier et al. US Patent 6,134,549

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however,

Art Unit: 2177

will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greta Robinson whose telephone number is (703)308-7565. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If any attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached at (703)305-9790.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703)746-7238, (for formal communications)

Or:

(703)746-5657, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-9600.

Art Unit: 2177



GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Greta Robinson

Primary Examiner

May 8, 2003